

Appl. No. : 10/534,186  
Amdt. Dated: December 28, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2007

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please insert Figure 5, as found on the attached New Sheet.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected. Claim 17 was previously canceled. Claim 1 has been amended while claims 13 and 14 have been canceled herein. Therefore, claims 1-12, 15 and 16 are pending and at issue. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims in view of the foregoing amendments and arguments.

The drawings stand objected to for allegedly failing to show every feature specified in the claims. The Office Action alleges that the gyro suspension, as specified in claim 13, is not shown in the drawings. Applicants have cancelled claim 13 and therefore it is no longer at issue. The Office Action also alleges that the conductor surrounded by a first semiconducting layer is not shown in the figures. While the Office Action does not specify in which claim this language is found, Applicants believe the Office Action is referring to claim 15. Applicants are adding new Figure 5 to more clearly illustrate the recited subject matter. Support for this amendment can be found in original claim 15, as well as on page 2, lines 29-34. Applicants have also amended the description of the drawings to describe the figure as well as the detailed description to mimic the language found in the original description on page 2. Therefore, Applicants assert that this subject matter is supported in the original application and is not new matter. Thus, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 14 has been canceled and therefore, is no longer at issue.

Claims 1, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colello in view of Kawamura. This rejection is based upon a misunderstanding of the present claims and/or a mischaracterization of the cited references.

As discussed throughout the specification and recited in claim 1, the present concept is directed to the synergistic effects achieved for a power system, such as for a vehicle driving system. For example, the synergistic effects result in a system where the flywheel can be energized and de-energized with high efficiency when high power supply is available and when high power is required, respectively, such as for heavy braking and acceleration. Additionally, the system permits the flywheel to be energized and de-energized with high efficiency when low power supply is available and when low power is required, such as for charging and discharging the battery. There is nothing in either of Colello or Kawamura to suggest such synergistic results. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not combine the references as suggested by the Office Action.

The proposed combination is also improper. Kawamura is directed to a generator suitable for relatively lower voltage ranges, such as 12-24V and 100-200V. Such voltage levels would be suitable for powering vehicle appliances, such as the automatic electronic equipment and auxiliaries in the vehicle at a lower to moderate voltage. The generator in Kawamura would not be suitable for powering a flywheel at the high voltage levels necessary in the system.

Additionally, Kawamura is directed to a device designed to operate solely as a generator. Thus the generator in Kawamura, it is not suitable to energize and de-energize a flywheel at any voltage, let alone at the high voltage as necessary. Therefore, the combination of Kawamura with Colello is improper. Moreover, the proposed combination would not result in the claimed features recited in claim 1. In view of the above, the rejection of claim 1, as well as dependent claims 8 and 9, should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The remaining dependent claims, 2-7, 10-12, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colello in view of Kawamura and further in view of

Appl. No. : 10/534,186  
Amdt. Dated: December 28, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2007


a variety of references, including Sadarangani, Ueyama, Leijon, Nilson and Blake. Claims 2-7, 10-12, 15 and 15 depend from and more specifically recite the features of claim 1. As discussed above, each of Colello and Kawamura, when taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in independent claim 1. The remaining cited references fail to overcome the deficiencies found in Colello and Kawamura. Therefore, the rejections of claims 2-7, 10-12 and 15 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request entry of Figure 5, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims and allowance of the case. Should any informal matters remain which can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, Applicant requests that the undersigned be contacted by phone in order to expedite the prosecution of the present case.

If any fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (37399-400300) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joseph H. Herron  
Registration No. 53,019

Seyfarth Shaw LLP  
Attorneys for Assignee  
131 South Dearborn Street  
Suite 2400  
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5577  
312-460-5000  
312-460-7000 (fax)